

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/034,952	12/27/2001	Jacques Debiez	2001-072-TOU	9352
51344 7590 09/11/2007 BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C. / SUN / STK 1000 TOWN CENTER, TWENTY-SECOND FLOOR			EXAMINER	
			PYZOCHA, MICHAEL J	
SOUTHFIELD, MI 48075-1238		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2137	
				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
			MAIL DATE	DÉLIVERY MODE
			· 09/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Antique Occurrence	10/034,952	DEBIEZ ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Michael Pyzocha	2137			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with	n the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Description of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAL 136(a). In no event, however, may a report will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHE te, cause the application to become ABAI	ATION. Note that the state of this communication. NOONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 J	July 2007				
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)☐ Thi	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are pending in the application		•			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	awn from consideration.				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) <u>1-6 and 9-13</u> is/are rejected.					
7)⊠ Claim(s) 7 and 8 is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.				
Application Papers	·				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examina	er				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		y the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	examiner. Note the attached (Office Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		119(a)-(d) or (f).			
1. Certified copies of the priority documen					
2. Certified copies of the priority documen	•	·			
 Copies of the certified copies of the price application from the International Burea 	•	eceived in this National Stage			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	` ''	eceived			
		333,134			
Attachment(s)					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Sur	mmary (PTO-413) Mail Date			
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		ormal Patent Application			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06) Application/Control Number: 10/034,952 Page 2

Art Unit: 2137

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-13 are pending.

2. Response filed 07/30/2007 has been received and considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, and 11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischer (US 5001752) in view of Hasebe et al. (US 7000114) and further in view of Mincher et al. (US 5408506).

As per claim 1, Fischer discloses private time; a private time source in the form of a local running clock and indicating a published time source in the form of a local running clock and indicating a published time; at least one power supply arranged to power the private time source and the published time source (see figures 1 and 5 and column 3 line 58 through column 4 line 27); and control logic programmed to perform a time stamping

Art Unit: 2137

operation by receiving a message, appending the published time to the message to create a timestamp, and digitally signing the timestamp with a private key (see column 6 lines 9-57).

Fischer fails to disclose a method of updating the published time using a trusted external time source and verifying the difference between the updated value and the current value is within a predetermined value.

However, Hasebe et al. teaches a published time source update by sending a request to the trusted external time source for a published time update (see column 11 lines 43-60), receiving a reply from the trusted external time source including the published time update, updating the published time with the published time update (see column 11 line 61 through column 12 line 27) and Mincher et al. teaches updating a clock value if an update condition is satisfied, wherein the update condition is based in part on a time difference between the private time and the published time update (see column 3 lines 50-63).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to update the clock of Fischer using the methods put forth by Hasebe et al. and Mincher et al.

Application/Control Number: 10/034,952

Art Unit: 2137

Motivation to do so would have been to verify the update is from the trusted time source (see Hasebe et al. column 11 line 61 through column 12 line 27) and to handle errors caused by the difference between the current clock value and the update value (see Mincher et al. column 3 lines 50-63).

As per claim 2, the modified Fischer, Hasebe et al. and Mincher et al. system discloses a printed circuit board including a connector for connecting to a bus of a computer, wherein the private time source, the public time source, the at least one power supply, and the control logic are mounted to the printed circuit board (see Fischer figures 1 and 5).

As per claim 4, the modified Fischer, Hasebe et al. and Mincher et al. system discloses the control logic is programmed to perform the published time source update at least once per month (see Hasebe et al. column 12 lines 28-41). As described by Hasebe et al., the time updates can occur at any prescribed regular time interval.

As per claims 5, 11, and 12, the modified Fischer, Hasebe et al. and Mincher et al. system discloses the update condition is not satisfied when the time difference is greater than a predetermined value (see Mincher et al. column 3 lines 50-63), but fails to explicitly disclose this value being 6 hours. However, Fischer discloses checking a time different and if this

Application/Control Number: 10/034,952

Art Unit: 2137

difference is greater than a few milliseconds per day then to give an error (see column 4 lines 2-9). Since 6 hours is greater than a few milliseconds and would cause an error the modified Fischer, Hasebe et al. and Mincher et al. system discloses the limitations of claim 5.

As per claim 6, the modified Fischer, Hasebe et al. and Mincher et al. system discloses updating the published time with the published time update in a manner that is based on a time different between the published time and the published time update (see Mincher et al. column 3 lines 50-63).

5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Fischer, Hasebe et al. and Mincher et al. system as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Esker (US 6236277).

As per claim 3, the modified Fischer, Hasebe et al. and Mincher et al. system fails to disclose the use of crystal oscillators to stabilize the time sources.

However, Esker teaches such crystal oscillators (see column 7 lines 3-11).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use crystal oscillators to stabilize the time sources of the modified Fischer, Hasebe et al. and Mincher et al. system.

Application/Control Number: 10/034,952

Art Unit: 2137

Motivation to do so would have been that a crystal oscillator is a common way of efficiently maintaining a clock.

6. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Fischer, Hasebe et al. and Mincher et al. system as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Watson (US 6775704).

As per claims 9 and 10, the modified Fischer, Hasebe et al. and Mincher et al. system fails to disclose the update condition is further based on an elapsed time between sending the request and receiving the reply.

However, Watson teaches checking this time delay (see column 7 lines 29-32).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the verification of the time delay of the response in the modified Fischer, Hasebe et al. and Mincher et al. system.

Motivation to do so would have been to protect the system against replay attacks.

7. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Fischer, Hasebe et al. and Mincher et al. system as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Terao (US 6651167).

Art Unit: 2137

As per claim 13, the modified Fischer, Hasebe et al. and Mincher et al. system fails to explicitly disclose the circuit board is encapsulated in a tamperproof enclosure.

However, Terao teaches such an enclosure (see column 7 lines 2-11).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to enclose the modified Fischer, Hasebe et al. and Mincher et al. system circuit board in a tamperproof enclosure.

Motivation to do so would have been to make the system more secure.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 8. Claims 7 and 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art fails to teach using different methods of updating a time source based on the different between two time values and the difference being explicitly 5 seconds.

Art Unit: 2137

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 07/30/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Mincher does not disclose the "private time" "published time" and "published time update" and that Mincher does not disclose the limitations of claim 5.

With respect to Applicant's argument that Mincher does not disclose the "private time" "published time" and "published time update", one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In the rejection above, Fischer and Hasebe teach each of these different times. Mincher was relied upon for the teaching of updating a clock value based on a time difference between the private time (i.e. the node's clock) and the published time update (i.e. the calculated average clock values of the master node). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use this teaching of updating as a reason to update the published time value of Hasebe. Applicant further states there is no motivation to combine the references; however, as given above, motivation to do so would have been to verify the update is from the trusted time source (see Hasebe et

Art Unif: 2137

al. column 11 line 61 through column 12 line 27) and to handle errors caused by the difference between the current clock value and the update value (see Mincher et al. column 3 lines 50-63).

With respect to Applicant's argument that Mincher does not disclose the limitations of claim 5; when the tolerance limit is exceeded more steps are required before the update can be performed. In other words, when the tolerance limit is not exceeded the update condition is satisfied and the update happens at that point. However, when the tolerance limit is exceeded the update condition is not satisfied and the clock is not updated at that point; more processing must occur before an update can attempt to occur. Therefore, when the tolerance limit is exceeded the update condition is no satisfied.

Conclusion

11. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened

statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Pyzocha whose telephone number is (571) 272-3875. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm first Fridays of the bi-week off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/034,952 Page 11

Art Unit: 2137

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MJP

EMMANUEL L. MOISE SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER